

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

REMARKS

Claims 1-84 are pending in this application. Claims 1-60 are currently amended. Claims 61-84 are new. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to Claims 1-60 is found at least at page 14, lines 14-15, page 14, line 31-page 15, line 12, page 22, lines 22-23, and page 27, line 3, and claims 1-60, as originally filed. Support for new claims 61, 67, 73 and 79 is found at least at page 13, lines 17-18, page 24, lines 5-30, and page 26, lines 9-21. Support for new claims 62-64, 68-70, 74-76 and 80-82 is found at least at page 25, line 6-page 26, line 2. Support for new claims 65, 71, 77 and 83 is found at least at page 13, line 31-page 14, line 2, and page 16, beginning at line 4. Support for new claims 66, 72, 78 and 84 is found at least at page 13, line 31-page 14, line 12.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 2 16, 17, 30, 31, 33, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aapa in view of Lowery et al. Each of claims 1, 2 16, 17, 30, 31, 33, 46 and 47, as now amended, is allowable for the reasons that follow. No combination of Aapa and Lowery et al. teaches or suggests all of the elements any of amended claims 1, 2 16, 17, 30, 31, 33, 46 and 47.

Amended claim 1 recites receiving a single request specifying multiple content components derived from content hosted by a plurality of distinct, separately accessible component servers for forming a personalized network page. Aapa (page 3, lines 10-21) does not teach or suggest this feature. Aapa merely describes a user screen that is illustrated at Figure 1 having multiple content objects displayed thereon. Aapa does not teach or suggest how the content

objects were retrieved and assembled together in the screen shot. Aapa does not teach or suggest whether a single request was sent and/or received for the multiple content components, nor does Aapa teach or suggest that the content components are retrieved for forming a personalized network page.

Amended claim 1 further recites that after receiving the single request, a plurality of information requests for the content are generated as parallel worker threads spawned from a main execution thread. Aapa (page 6, line 12-20) does not teach or suggest this feature. Aapa describes request and receipt of email followed by request and receipt of stock quotes. These two requests do not represent parallel threads spawned from a main execution thread, and are instead consecutive routines that occur one after the other.

Amended claim 1 further recites sending the plurality of requests as parallel or rapid sequential worker threads so that each information request to the component server hosting the content corresponding to the information request before receiving a response to any of the information requests, thereby permitting concurrent generation of the content components at the component servers. Aapa clearly does not teach or suggest this feature. Aapa states, "After the CRM content is retrieved, process 424 executes", and "After the email content is retrieved, process 426 executes."

Neither do Lowery et al. (col. 4, lines 40-55 and col. 6, lines 20-32) teach or suggest this feature. In the discussion of Lowery et al. at column 4, a single shared processor running on a single machine is described as running multiple threads. In the discussion of Lowery et al. at column 6, a page server and a web server are described as simultaneously processing two different requests. Lowery et al. describe two machines each receiving a single request. This is not the same thing as receiving a single request for multiple content components,

and then sending multiple requests as parallel or rapid sequential worker threads.

Therefore, claim 1 is now allowable. Claim 2 is allowable as being dependent from claim 1. Claims 16, 31 and 46, as now amended, are also allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 17 and 30 are allowable as being dependent from claim 16. Claim 33 is allowable as being dependent from claim 31. Claim 47 is allowable as being dependent from claim 46.

Claims 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 30, 33, 43, 44, 45, 48, 58, 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aapa in view of Lowery et al. in further view of Greenwood. Each of claims 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 30, 33, 43, 44, 45, 48, 58, 59 and 60, as now amended, is allowable for the reasons that follow. No combination of Aapa, Lowery et al. and Greenwood teaches or suggests all of the elements any of amended claims 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 30, 33, 43, 44, 45, 48, 58, 59 and 60. For the reasons set forth above with reference to amended claims 1, 16, 31 and 46, claims 3, 13, 14 and 15 are allowable as being dependent from claim 1. Claims 18, 28, 29 and 30 are allowable as being dependent from claim 16. Claims 33, 43, 44 and 45 are allowable as being dependent from claim 31. Claims 48, 58, 59 and 60 are allowable as being dependent from claim 46.

Claims 4-12, 19-27, 34-42 and 49-57 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aapa in view of Lowery et al. in further view of Greenwood in further view of Anuff et al. Each of claims 4-12, 19-27, 34-42 and 49-57, as now amended, is allowable for the reasons that follow. No combination of Aapa, Lowery et al., Greenwood and Anuff et al. teaches or suggests all of the elements of any of amended claims 4-12, 19-27, 34-42 and 49-57. For the reasons set forth above with reference to amended claims 1, 16, 31 and 46,

claims 4-12 are allowable as being dependent from claim 1. Claims 19-27 are allowable as being dependent from claim 16. Claims 34-42 are allowable as being dependent from claim 31. Claims 49-57 are allowable as being dependent from claim 46.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 61-84 are allowable for the following reasons. Claims 61-66, 67-72, 73-78 and 79-84 are allowable as being dependent respectively on amended claims 1, 16, 31 and 46.

Claims 61, 67, 73 and 79 are allowable for the further reason that each requires uniquely identifying a user who wishes to view a personalized network page regardless of which access terminal is being used.

Claims 62, 68, 74 and 80 are allowable for the further reason that each requires caching one or more of the content components for retrieval without contacting the component server in a future request.

Claims 63, 69, 75 and 81 are allowable as being dependent from Claims 62, 68, 74 and 80, respectively, and for the further reason that each requires that the caching comprises indexing at least one of the content components according to one or more user preferences.

Claims 64, 70, 76 and 82 are allowable for the further reason that each requires retrieving one or more previously cached content components for including in the personalized network page without contacting the corresponding component server.

Claims 65, 71, 77 and 83 are allowable as being dependent from claims 64, 70, 76 and 82, respectively, and for the further reason that each requires that at least one of the cached content components was indexed according to one or more user preferences, and wherein the retrieving comprises calling the at least one cached content component according to the indexing.


Claims 66, 72, 78 and 84 are further allowable because each requires providing a form allowing a user to select the components from a library of components.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: 5-24-05

By 
Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2522
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No.: 29585